

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated July 13, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on October 15, 2007. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 9, 11-18 and 25 are pending in the application. Claims 9, 11-18 and 25 remain pending following entry of this response. Claim 25 has been amended. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9, 11-18 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Anderson et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,537,526, hereinafter, "*Anderson*"), in view of *Nolan et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,253,362, hereinafter, "*Nolan*").

The Examiner states claims 9, 11-18, and 25 are unpatentable over *Anderson* in view of *Nolan*; however, the Examiner never references *Anderson*, instead the Examiner references *Barger*. Applicant will assume the Examiner intended to reference *Barger* and not *Anderson* since the Examiner repeatedly references *Barger* and the references seem to fit the argument the Examiner is making.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See MPEP § 2142. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP § 2143.

The present rejection fails to establish at least the third criteria because even when combined the references fail to teach an annotation browser displaying annotations, wherein the annotations have links to associated data objects, and *when those links are selected, an application used to manipulate the data object is invoked*. In rejecting claims 9 and 25 the Examiner relies principally on *Barger*; however, with respect to the limitations mentioned above, the Examiner states,

“Bar however does not disclose an annotation browser configured to display annotations and links to associated annotated data objects; and wherein selecting the links to the associated data objects causes an application used to manipulate the associated data objects to be invoked.”

Instead, the Examiner relies on *Nolan* to teach this element and claims he does so at Column 2, lines 50-60. However, the idea of which *Nolan* speaks is in no way comparable to the ideas recited in claims 9 and 25.

Nolan teaches that a document contained in a database is being accessed by the documents appropriate application. For example, a spreadsheet is being viewed in a program similar to Microsoft Excel. One or more of the cells in the spreadsheet may have an annotation and an associated link. When the link is selected the annotation is displayed. The example of an annotation that is given by *Nolan* is some sort of form that may have various attributes obtained from one or more object instances of one or more object classes. *Nolan* goes on to liken the link in the spreadsheet to “hypertext,” in which a word or symbol in one document is linked to another document.

However, the claims recite an “annotation browser is configured to display annotations and links to associated annotated data objects; and wherein selecting the links to the associated data objects causes an application used to manipulate the associated data objects to be invoked.” Examples of embodiments covered by the recited language of claims 9 and 25 can be found in specification, paragraphs [0118] through [0124]:

As an example, a medical researcher may be interested in reviewing annotations authored by his manager, and/or annotations created within a certain time range

(e.g., within the last month), as well as reviewing the annotated data. For example, the manager may have generated annotations that question the validity of certain data and the researcher may be charged with verifying and/or correcting the data in question... a user [the researcher] may be presented with a main query building GUI screen 1040 of FIG. 10A allowing the user[the researcher] to build a query against data and/or annotations by adding search conditions (i.e., query predicates) based on searchable fields of the data or annotations... **the annotations satisfying the annotation condition 1044 (describing data satisfying the data conditions 1042) may be listed with a link to the annotated data** (if an annotation describes data contained in more than one data source, a link to each data source may be provided). **A user may optionally view the annotated data by selecting the link which may, for example, automatically invoke an application 120** associated with the annotated data source, along with an indication of the annotated data (e.g., highlighted text, an annotation icon, or some other type of indication).

In contrast to claims 9 and 25, Nolan does not teach an annotation browser, annotations linking back to the data objects, or the invoking of an application to display the original data object. *Nolan* merely teaches links to annotations while viewing data described by those annotations. However, Nolan is completely silent as to the processing data in the opposite direction as recited in the claims, namely *accessing annotated data via a link displayed with an annotation*.

Therefore, claims 9 and 25 and their dependents are believed to be allowable and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Randol W. Read, Reg. No. 43,876/

Randol W. Read
Registration No. 43,876
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants